

Senator GREGG objected to the President's intention to move control of the Census Bureau from the Commerce Department into the White House. This unprecedented move to politicize the 2010 Decennial Census has met with strong opposition from across the political spectrum. The Obama administration has since backtracked and attempted to downplay its role regarding the census. To his credit, Governor Locke has expressed his intention to not cede control of the 2010 census to the White House should he be confirmed.

I have encouraged our colleagues in the Senate Commerce Committee to ask Governor Locke several important questions at tomorrow's hearing, two of which are: What would he consider to be an inappropriate political interference from the White House regarding the census, and how would he respond to attempts from the White House to exert political influence over the conduct of the census?

□ 1045

I suspect that Governor Locke's responses to these questions will determine his fate in the Senate.

But there is a second and equally important point of contention and controversy over the census. The statistical adjustment of census data is prohibited by Federal law. However, there are some partisans who refuse to give up the cause of data manipulation. They want to manipulate the census results for political gain, for their own political gain, and, in the process, undermine the integrity of the country's entire statistical system.

I hope that our colleagues in the Senate will question Governor Locke about his thoughts regarding statistical adjustment. Governor Locke expressed his willingness to use adjustment as an "accuracy check." This comment must be expanded upon for members of the Senate Commerce Committee and all interested parties. Republicans and Democrats alike must truly guard the integrity of the constitutionally-mandated census in the United States. The appropriate allocation of Federal funds depend upon an accurate census.

My colleagues and I on the Census Subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member, are working to ensure that the 2010 Decennial Census is apolitical, fair and accurate. Governor Locke's confirmation should rest upon whether he shares this goal; a census free of White House political pressure and partisan influence and free of manipulation, and data manipulation in particular.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

PRESENTING A PROPER BUDGET FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, just a few moments ago the President of the United States made a press statement in which he outlined parts of his budget and then challenged the Republicans, or those who might oppose his budget, to come up with alternatives. Well, let me say in the spirit of St. Patrick, as a great descendant of the Irish aisle, I accept that challenge. I accept that challenge on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, but also on behalf of my constituents.

When I was home this weekend, I heard from many of them. In fact, I continued to hear from them on the plane ride back from Sacramento here to Dulles Airport. They said, please tell the President this: Let's get our priorities straight. Fix the financial system first. Get the economy working right. Then we will talk about your other ideas.

So I would say to the President, the better idea that I have from my constituents back home is set your sights on righting the financial institutions in America.

Now, what we have heard from the President by and large is well, it is somebody else's fault. It was the fault of the previous administration. And there may be some truth to that. But let's remember, for instance, with AIG it was Treasury Secretary Geithner who negotiated that deal with AIG. It was this administration that allowed something like \$30 billion to go to AIG just recently without any strings attached.

Let's focus on the situation we have with respect to our financial institutions first. The President tells us we have to do all these other things first. Well, as Warren Buffett said the other day, he doesn't think Franklin Delano Roosevelt said on the day after Pearl Harbor, "What a great opportunity for us to expand government. We shouldn't let this crisis be wasted."

Let's not listen to some around the President who say that a crisis like this gives us a great opportunity to do all of the things we have wanted to do with respect to government. Let's get down to the basics.

So let's talk about the budget that the President has presented to us. It increases spending by \$1 trillion over the next decade. It includes an additional \$250 billion placeholder for another financial bailout. It likely leads to a 12 percent increase in discretionary spending. It permanently expands, makes larger, the Federal Government by nearly 3 percent of the gross domestic product over pre-recession levels. In other words, the answer to big government and big spending and big taxing and big borrowing is more big government, big spending, big taxes and big borrowing.

It raises taxes on all Americans by \$1.4 trillion over the next decade. It raises taxes on 3.2 million taxpayers by an average of \$300,000 over the next decade.

The President said look, he is going to raise taxes on the rich, but 95 percent of Americans are going to get a better deal. Well, guess what? His cap-and-trade plan, if adopted, is a cap-and-tax plan. He calls it cap-and-trade. It actually is cap-and-tax, because it increases the cost of anything basically produced by fossil fuels in America. That means your air conditioning, that means your heating, that means your transportation. That means it is going to be placed into the cost of food being developed, of food being delivered to us. It is going to wipe out any suggested tax relief that the average family gets, and more. And the average family uses these things as a higher percentage of these income than do the rich, therefore they will be disproportionately impacted.

So, Madam Speaker, let's look at what the President has presented. I love his melodious tones as he explains to us he is not for more spending, he is not for more taxes, he is not for more borrowing, he is not for expansion of entitlement programs. But his budget does precisely all of those things. It is a net increase in taxes on every American. It is an increase in spending. It is an increase in borrowing on my children and my grandchildren and everyone's children and grandchildren. It is the greatest transfer of wealth from one generation to another in the history of the United States.

Madam Speaker, you don't have to dislike a President of the United States personally, you don't have to dislike what he is trying to do, to dislike his policies, particularly if they undercut the very promises he is making, if they undercut the very things he says we want to do. We stand ready to join him. We stand ready to join him in meeting the goals that he sets up. But, Madam Speaker, this budget taxes too much, spends too much, borrows too much. It is in fact a repudiation of the very goals he has established.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I also come down to the floor to talk about the President's budget, and I am going to focus on the issue of taxing. There is one provision in the tax increase of the President's budget that is very detrimental to our country and to our society, and that is the carbon tax aspect of this. Imagine paying more for every piece of energy that you use. That is what this cap-and-trade, cap-and-tax plan will do.

I have seen the direct result of placing taxes and additional regulatory burdens on my congressional district in

Southern Illinois. I always tell the story about the 1990 amendments to the Clean Air Act where because of Federal regulation, in this one case, in this one case, 1,200 miners lost their jobs.

I was told by someone who was the business manager for the United Mine Workers of America in Southern Illinois that during 1990 he was responsible for 14,000 mine workers in Southern Illinois. After the amendments were passed, he then was reorganized into a three-State region to only bargain for 4,000 United Mine workers. 10,000 mine workers' jobs were lost.

That was just in the cap-and-trade clean air amendments 1990s, where we had technology to make the transformation. This carbon dioxide cap-and-tax provision, we do not have the technology available today to effect this change.

So this is what happened. This is actually a picture of mine workers who lost their jobs. This is the mine I was talking about, Peabody No. 10 in Kincaid, Illinois. The interesting thing about this mine, it is very, very efficient in that the mine was right across the street from the power plant, so you saved on the transportation costs, whether that be the trucks or that would be the rail applications. There was a little conveyor belt going across the road to the power plant. This mine was closed down. These miners lost their jobs.

Now, under the new regime of the President's bill that taxes too much, he proposes additional taxation of \$686 billion through a carbon tax. This carbon tax will be passed on to everybody who uses fossil fuels in America.

You might say, I don't want to use fossil fuels. It is like the story where the individual says I don't like coal, I don't like nuclear power, I don't like hydroelectric. I like electricity. The problem with this is 50 percent of all electricity, even the electricity that lights this Chamber, is produced by coal-based electricity generation. The power plant just down the road two blocks from here is a coal-fired power plant. Fifty percent.

If you put additional taxation on that fossil fuel, that cost will be passed on to the individuals and the consumers. This is the worst time to really attack our economy through additional taxation, because of the economic slowdown, the economic recession, the competitive nature of the world. If we not only put a challenge to our use of fossil fuels in this country, not only coal, natural gas as a fossil fuel, gasoline as a fossil fuel, estimations of the last cap-and-trade bills are 50 cents additional to the cost of a gallon of gas.

Where does that money go to when we collect it? There is an old story. When the bank robbers rob a bank and they get away to their hideaway and they put the loot on the table, what happens? That is when you have the fights break out. That is when one bad

guy shoots the other bad guy and says, I am taking all the money for myself.

What this cap-and-tax regime will do will allow bureaucrats, it will allow us in Washington, to decide how that money is going to be split up, and it will be folks here making that determination. Why do you think so many people are at the table? They are at the table because they want part of your tax dollars that you are going to pay through higher rates to us and they want to get benefited.

You can look across all the regimes that are at the table. They are at the table because they want part of that revenue stream. What this revenue stream will do is not only kill the fossil fuel of this industry, which is hundreds of thousands of jobs and low-cost power, it will make us not competitive with the developing nations who are using coal and having low cost power.

MOVING FORWARD TO A NEW ENERGY FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, last week I had two very exciting meetings with people who have some insights about how we can move forward to use a new energy future to really revive our economy, and I thought I would take a couple of moments to advise my colleagues about these meetings. I thought they would be interested in them.

First, I met some absolutely brilliant people up in Boston area at the MIT, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Energy Club. This is a club of graduate and post-graduate students who have come together to organize themselves to try to promote ideas about how to build a new, clean energy future for the country.

These are brilliant people, post-graduates in chemistry, electrical engineering, mechanical engineering. These are really some of the creme de la creme of our young geniuses coming up who can help build our new economy. It was fascinating to me, because these were people who were tremendously optimistic even in these tough times about the ability to grow the U.S. economy, if we will get serious about promoting the future of new energy technologies.

□ 1100

I am convinced after meeting these relatively young people that we've got a bright future in our economy if we can unleash these intellectual geniuses. They told me that they were waiting for a signal from Washington, DC, that we were really going to embrace these new technologies; and they told me about some of these new technologies that they're fascinated in. I thought I would share some of them today.

They told me about a technology company called Ramgen, a company out in my State of Washington, that

has an ability to compress carbon dioxide so that someday we might be able to burn coal in a way that carbon dioxide doesn't go into the air but we compress that carbon dioxide and put it under the ground permanently so it doesn't cause global warming. They're waiting for Congress to pass a bill that will essentially direct the economy in that direction. They told me it's very important to have a bill that will create a fund to be able to support the research so that these people at MIT can help develop this and various other technologies. The cap-and-trade bill, which I'll talk about a little later, is a bill that will do just that, to help that technology forward.

We talked about the Ausra Company, a company that just opened the first manufacturing plant in the United States, commercial plant, for concentrated solar energy, so you can concentrate the sun's rays and generate electricity. They are now hiring several hundred people in Nevada, building these new plants, so that we can convert the sun's energy directly to electricity, and they were very excited about that technology.

I met up there the leader of A123 Battery Company. At A123 Battery, they make lithium ion batteries that can power plug-in hybrid cars and ultimately all electric cars using lithium ion. The beauty of this, of course, is that if you use electricity, you don't have to import gasoline from Saudi Arabia, you don't have to wrap yourself around that national security threat, and you can use electricity rather than oil. But they told me they're waiting for a signal from Congress to move toward electricity in our cars. Now we started that in the stimulus bill to help them, but now we need to move forward to have a bill to essentially regulate carbon dioxide so we can have another signal to industry to start moving to electric cars.

We talked about a company called the Sapphire Energy Company. The Sapphire Energy Company just started construction of ponds—and this will sound like science fiction but it's real—ponds where you can grow algae and the algae takes the sun's energy and turns it into lipids and then you essentially press it and you get fuel that you make gasoline out of. So we can use algae to essentially eat carbon dioxide out of our coal-fired plants and then use it to make a liquid automobile fuel that's chemically indistinguishable from gasoline. Pretty exciting company.

We talked about the AltaRock Company. The AltaRock Company is a company, again up in the State of Washington, which is trying to commercialize what we call engineered geothermal, where you can poke a hole down in the Earth, you pump water down there, it collects to a 300-degree temperature, you bring it up, generate steam and make electricity. Again, zero CO₂.

These companies are waiting for a signal from Congress, the cap-and-